arXiv:1405.1163v1 [math.GR] 6 May 2014

# ISOLATED ORDERINGS ON AMALGAMATED FREE PRODUCTS

TETSUYA ITO

Abstract. We show that an amalgamated free product $G *_A H$ admits a discrete isolated ordering, under some assumptions of $G, H$ and $A$. This generalizes the author's previous construction of isolated orderings, and unlike known constructions of isolated orderings, can produce an isolated ordering with many non-trivial proper convex subgroups.

## 1. Introduction

A total ordering $<_G$ of a group $G$ is a *left-ordering* if the relation $<_G$ is preserved by the left action of $G$ itself, namely, $a <_G b$ implies $ga <_G gb$ for all $a, b, g \in G$. A group admitting a left-ordering is called *left-orderable*.

For $g \in G$, let $U_g$ be the set of left-orderings $<_G$ of $G$ that satisfy $1 <_G g$. The set of all left-orderings of $G$ can be equipped with a topology so that $\{U_g\}_{g\in G}$ is an open sub-basis. We denote the resulting topological space by $\mathrm{LO}(G)$ and call the *space of left-orderings of* $G$ [12].

An *isolated ordering* is a left ordering which is an isolated point in $\mathrm{LO}(G)$. A left-ordering $<_G$ is isolated if and only if $<_G$ is determined by the sign of finitely many elements. That is, $<_G$ is isolated if and only if there exists a finite subset $\{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$ of $G$ such that $\bigcap_{i=1}^n U_{g_i} = \{<_G\}$. We call such a finite subset a *characteristic positive set* of $<_G$. In particular, if the positive cone $P(<_G)$ of a left ordering $<_G$, the sub semi-group of $G$ consisting of $<_G$-positive elements, is finitely generated then $<_G$ is isolated.

An isolated ordering $<_G$ of $G$ is *genuine* if $\mathrm{LO}(G)$ contains non-isolated points. This is equivalent to saying that $\mathrm{LO}(G)$ is not a finite set. Since the classification of groups admitting only finitely many left-orderings (non-genuine isolated orderings) is known (see [7, Theorem 5.2.1]), we concentrate our attention to genuine isolated orderings. Several classes of groups do not have genuine isolated ordering. The non-existence of isolated orderings are observed for the free abelian groups of rank $> 1$ [12] and the free groups of rank $> 1$ [8]. More generally, by using a dynamical realizations, it is shown that the free products of more than one groups [10], and virtually solvable groups [11] never admit a genuine isolated ordering.

Recent developments provide several examples of genuine isolated orderings, but our catalogues and knowledge are still limited and it is still hard to predict when a left-orderable group admits an isolated ordering. At present, we have three ways of constructing (genuine) isolated orderings; Dehornoy-like orderings [5, 9], partially central cyclic amalgamation [6], and triangular presentations with certain special elements [3].

The aim of this paper is to extend a partially central cyclic amalgamated product construction of isolated orderings [6] in more general and abstract settings.

To state main theorem, we introduce the following two notions. Let $A$ be a subgroup of a left-orderable group $G$. First we extend the notion of isolatedness in a relative setting.

**Definition 1.1.** Let $\mathsf{Res} : LO(G) \to LO(A)$ be the continuous map induced by the restriction of left orderings of $G$ on $A$. We say a left ordering $<_G$ of $G$ is *relatively isolated* with respect to $A$ if $<_G$ is an isolated point in the subspace $\mathsf{Res}^{-1}(\mathsf{Res}(<_G)) \subset \mathrm{LO}(G)$. Thus, $<_G$ is relatively isolated if and only if there exists a finite subset $\{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$ of $G$ such that $\mathsf{Res}^{-1}(\mathsf{Res}(<_G)) \cap \bigcap U_{g_i} = \{<_G\}$. We say such a finite set a *characteristic positive set* of $<_G$ relative to $A$.

The next property plays a crucial role in our construction of isolated orderings.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 20F60 , Secondary 06F15.

*Key words and phrases.* Orderable groups, isolated ordering, space of left orderings.

**Definition 1.2.** We say that a subgroup $A$ is a *stepping* with respect to a left-ordering $<_G$ of $G$ if for each $g \in G$ both the maximal and the minimal

$$\begin{cases} a(g) = \max_{<_G}\{a \in A \mid a \leq_G g\} \\ a_+(g) = \min_{<_G}\{a \in A \mid g <_G a\}. \end{cases}$$

always exist.

Using these notions our main theorem is stated as follows. Here is a situation we consider. Let $A$, $G$ and $H$ be left-orderable groups. We fix embeddings $i_G : A \hookrightarrow G$ and $i_H : A \hookrightarrow H$ so we always regard $A$ as a common subgroup of $G$ and $H$.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let $<_G$ and $<_H$ be discrete orderings of $G$ and $H$. Assume that $<_G$ and $<_H$ satisfy the following conditions.*

(a) *The restriction of $<_G$ and $<_H$ on $A$ yields the same left ordering $<_A$ of $A$.*
(b) *$A$ is a stepping with respect to both $<_G$ and $<_H$.*
(c) *$<_G$ is isolated and $<_H$ is relatively isolated with respect to $A$.*

*Then the amalgamated free product $X = G *_A H$ admits isolated orderings $<_X^{(1)}$ and $<_X^{(2)}$ which have the following properties:*

(1) *Both $<_X^{(1)}$ and $<_X^{(2)}$ extend the orderings $<_G$ and $<_H$: if $g <_G g'$ $(g, g' \in G)$ then $g <_X^{(i)} g'$, and if $h <_H h'$ $(h, h' \in H)$ then $h <_X^{(i)} h'$ $(i = 1, 2)$.*
(2) *If $\{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$ is a characteristic positive set of $<_G$ and $\{h_1, \dots, h_n\}$ is a characteristic positive set of $<_H$ relative to $A$, then*

$$\{g_1, \dots, g_m, h_1, \dots, h_n, h_{\mathsf{min}} a_{\mathsf{min}}^{-1} g_{\mathsf{min}}\}$$

*is a characteristic positive set of $<_X^{(1)}$ and*

$$\{g_1, \dots, g_m, h_1, \dots, h_n, g_{\mathsf{min}} a_{\mathsf{min}}^{-1} h_{\mathsf{min}}\}$$

*is a characteristic positive set of $<_X^{(2)}$. Here $a_{\mathsf{min}}$, $g_{\mathsf{min}}$ and $h_{\mathsf{min}}$ represent the minimal positive elements of the orderings $<_A$, $<_G$ and $<_H$, respectively. (Note that $A$ is a stepping implies that $<_A$ is discrete, see Lemma 2.1).*
(3) *$<_X^{(1)}$ is discrete with the minimal positive element $h_{\mathsf{min}} a_{\mathsf{min}}^{-1} g_{\mathsf{min}}$, and $<_X^{(2)}$ is discrete with the minimal positive element $g_{\mathsf{min}} a_{\mathsf{min}}^{-1} h_{\mathsf{min}}$.*
(4) *$A$ is a stepping with respect to the orderings $<_X^{(1)}$ and $<_X^{(2)}$.*

The assumption (a) is an obvious requirement for $X$ to have a left ordering extending both $<_G$ and $<_H$. The crucial assumptions are (b) and (c). It should be emphasized that the orderings $<_A$ and $<_H$ may not be isolated.

We also note that, The property (4) allows us to iterate a similar construction, hence Theorem 1.3 produces huge examples of isolated orderings.

**Remark 1.4.** As for the existence of isolated orderings, Theorem 1.3 contains the main theorem of [6] as a special case, but [6, Theorem 1.1] contains much stronger results.

In [6], we treated the case that $A = \mathbb{Z}$ with additional assumptions that the isolated ordering $<_H$ is preserved by the right action of $A$, and that $A$ is central in $G$. Under these assumptions, we proved that the positive cone of the resulting isolated ordering is *finitely generated*, and determined all convex subgroups. Moreover, one can algorithmically determine whether $x <_X x'$ or not.

On the other hand, for the isolated orderings $<_X^{(i)}$ in Theorem 1.3, we do not know whether its positive cone is finitely generated or not in general, and a computation of $<_X^{(i)}$ is more complicated. As for the computational issues, see Remark 2.13.

In light of the above remark, finding a generating set of the positive cone of $<_X^{(i)}$, and determining when it is finitely generated are quite interesting.

As for convex subgroups, in Proposition 2.14 we show that a convex subgroup of $A$ with additional properties yields a convex subgroup of $(X, <_X)$. Thus, the resulting isolated ordering of

$X$ can admit many non-trivial convex subgroups. This also makes a sharp contrast in [6], where the obtained isolated ordering contains exactly one non-trivial proper convex subgroup. It should be emphasized that the Dubrovina-Dubrovin ordering of the braid groups [4] are the only known examples of genuine isolated ordering with more than one proper non-trivial convex subgroup. In Example 2.15, starting from $\mathbb{Z}$ with standard ordering, the simplest isolated ordering, we construct many isolated orderings with more than one non-trivial convex subgroups.

## Acknowledgement

The author was partially supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Research Activity start-up, Grant Number 25887030.

## 2. Construction of isolated orderings

Let $(S, <_S)$ be a totally ordered set. For $s, s' \in S$, we say $s'$ is the *successor* of $s$ and denote by $s \prec_S s'$, if $s'$ is the minimal element in $S$ that is strictly greater than $s$ with respect to the ordering $<_S$.

A left ordering $<_G$ of a group $G$ is *discrete* if there exists the successor $g_{\mathsf{min}}$ of the identity element. That is, $<_G$ admits the minimal $<_G$-positive element. By left-invariance, a discrete left ordering $<_G$ satisfy $gg_{\mathsf{min}}^{-1} \prec_G g \prec_G gg_{\mathsf{min}}$ for all $g \in G$.

Let us consider the situation in Theorem 1.3: Let $G$ and $H$ be groups admitting discrete left orderings $<_G$ and $<_H$, and $A$ be a common subgroup of $G$ and $H$, such that the restriction of $<_G$ and $<_H$ yield the same left ordering $<_A$ .

The assumption that $A$ is a stepping (assumption (b)) implies the following.

**Lemma 2.1.** *For a subgroup $A$ of a left-orderable group $G$, if $A$ is a stepping with respect to a left-ordering $<_G$, then the restriction of $<_G$ on $A$ is discrete.*

*Proof.* From the definition of stepping,

$$a_{\mathsf{min}} = \min_{<_A}\{a \in A \mid 1 <_A a\} = \min_{<_G}\{a \in A \mid 1 <_G a\} = a_+(1)$$

exists. □

Thus $<_A$ is also discrete. We denote the minimal positive elements of $<_A$, $<_G$ and $<_H$ by $a_{\mathsf{min}}$, $g_{\mathsf{min}}$ and $h_{\mathsf{min}}$, respectively. We put $g_{\mathsf{M}} = a_{\mathsf{min}}g_{\mathsf{min}}^{-1}$ and $h_{\mathsf{M}} = a_{\mathsf{min}}h_{\mathsf{min}}^{-1}$, so $g_{\mathsf{M}} \prec_G a_{\mathsf{min}}$ and $h_M \prec_H a_{\mathsf{min}}$.

We start to construct an isolated ordering on a group $X = G *_A H$. We explain the construction of the isolated ordering $<_X^{(1)}$, which we simply denote by $<_X$. The construction of $<_X^{(2)}$ is similar. We just apply the same construction by interchanging the role of $G$ and $H$.

The amalgamated free product structure of $X$ induces a filtration

$$\mathcal{F}_{-1}(X) \subset \mathcal{F}_{-0.5}(X) \subset \mathcal{F}_0(X) \subset \mathcal{F}_{0.5}(X) \subset \mathcal{F}_1(X) \subset \mathcal{F}_2(X) \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{F}_i(X) \subset \mathcal{F}_{i+1}(X) \subset \cdots$$

defined by

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{F}_{-1}(X) = \emptyset, \quad \mathcal{F}_{-0.5}(X) = A, \quad \mathcal{F}_0(X) = H, \quad \mathcal{F}_{0.5}(X) = G \cup H, \\ \mathcal{F}_{2i+1}(X) = G\mathcal{F}_{2i}, \\ \mathcal{F}_{2i}(X) = H\mathcal{F}_{2i-1}. \end{cases}$$

The non-integer parts of the filtrations are exceptional, and the filtration $\mathcal{F}_{0.5}(X)$ is the most important because it is the restriction on $\mathcal{F}_{0.5}(X)$ that eventually characterizes the isolated ordering $<_X$.

Starting from $<_G$ and $<_H$, we inductively construct a total ordering $<_i$ on $\mathcal{F}_i(X)$. To be able to extend $<_i$ to a left ordering of $X$, we need the following obvious property.

**Definition 2.2.** We say a total ordering $<_i$ on $\mathcal{F}_i(X)$ is *compatible* if for any $x \in X$ and $s, t \in \mathcal{F}_i(X)$, $xs <_i xt$ whenever $s <_i t$ and $xs, xt \in \mathcal{F}_i(X)$.

By definition, if $<_i$ is a restriction of a left ordering of $X$ on $\mathcal{F}_i(X)$, then $<_i$ is compatible. Conversely, Bludov-Glass proved that a compatible ordering $<_i$ on $\mathcal{F}_i(X)$ can be extended to a compatible ordering $<_{i+1}$ of $\mathcal{F}_{i+1}(X)$ under some conditions [1]. This is a crucial ingredient of the proof of Bludov-Glass' theorem on necessary and sufficient conditions for an amalgamated free product to be left-orderable [1, Theorem A].

From the point of view of the topology of $\mathrm{LO}(G *_A H)$, it is suggestive to note that Bludov-Glass' extension of $<_i$ to $<_{i+1}$ is far from unique. This illustrates and explains the intuitively obvious fact that "most" left orderings of $G *_A H$ are not isolated. Our isolated ordering is constructed by specifying a situation that Bludov-Glass' extension procedure must be unique.

As the first step of construction, we define an ordering $<_{\mathsf{base}}$ on $\mathcal{F}_{0.5}(X)$. Since we have assumed that $A$ is a stepping with respect to both $<_G$ and $<_H$, we have the function

$$a : \mathcal{F}_{0.5}(X) \to A$$

defined by

$$a(x) = \begin{cases} \max_{<_G}\{a \in A \mid a \leq_G x\} & (x \in G) \\ \max_{<_H}\{a \in A \mid a \leq_H x\} & (x \in H). \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

Using the function $a$, we define the total ordering $<_{\mathsf{base}}$ as follows:

$$\begin{cases} g <_{\mathsf{base}} g' & \text{if } g, g' \in G \text{ and } g <_G g' \\ h <_{\mathsf{base}} h' & \text{if } h, h' \in H \text{ and } h <_H h' \\ h <_{\mathsf{base}} g & \text{if } h \in H - A, g \in G - A \text{ and } a(h) \leq_A a(g) \\ g <_{\mathsf{base}} h & \text{if } h \in H - A, g \in G - A \text{ and } a(g) <_A a(h) \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

The ordering $<_{\mathsf{base}}$ can be schematically understood by Figure 1.




FIGURE 1. Ordering $<_{\mathsf{base}}$ on $\mathcal{F}_{0.5}(X)$.

**Lemma 2.3.** *The ordering $<_{\mathsf{base}}$ is the unique compatible ordering of $\mathcal{F}_{0.5}(X)$ such that*

**B1:** *The restriction of $<_{\mathsf{base}}$ on $G$ and $H$ agrees with $<_G$ and $<_H$, respectively.*
**B2:** $h_{\mathsf{M}} = a_{\mathsf{min}} h_{\mathsf{min}}^{-1} <_{\mathsf{base}} g_{\mathsf{min}}$.

*Proof.* By definition, $<_{\mathsf{base}}$ is a compatible ordering with **[B1]** and **[B2]**. Assume that $<'$ is another compatible total ordering on $\mathcal{F}_{0.5}(X)$ with the same properties. To see the uniqueness, it is sufficient to show that for $g \in G - A$ and $h \in H - A$, $h <_{\mathsf{base}} g$ implies $h <' g$.

By definition of $<_{\mathsf{base}}$, $a(h) \leq_A a(g)$. If $a(h) <_A a(g)$, then $h <' a(h)a_{\mathsf{min}} \leq' a(g) <' g$ so $h <' g$. Assume that $a(h) = a(g)$ and put $a = a(g) = a(h)$. By **[B1]**, $1 <' a^{-1}h <' a_{\mathsf{min}}$ hence $1 <' a^{-1}h \leq' h_{\mathsf{M}} = a_{\mathsf{min}} h_{\mathsf{min}}^{-1}$. Similarly, $1 <' a^{-1}g$ so $g_{\mathsf{min}} \leq' a^{-1}g$. By **[B2]**,

$$a^{-1}h \leq' h_{\mathsf{M}} <' g_{\mathsf{min}} \leq' a^{-1}g,$$

hence $a^{-1}h <' a^{-1}g$. Since $<'$ is compatible, $h <' g$. □

Lemma 2.3, combined with our assumption (c) of Theorem 1.3, shows the following.

**Proposition 2.4.** *The compatible ordering $<_{\mathsf{base}}$ is characterized by finitely many inequalities: Let $\{g_1, \ldots, g_m\}$ be a characteristic positive set of $<_G$ and $\{h_1, \ldots, h_n\}$ be a characteristic positive*

*set of $<_H$ relative to $A$. Then $<_{\mathsf{base}}$ is the unique compatible ordering on $\mathcal{F}_{0.5}(X)$ that satisfies the inequalities*

$$\begin{cases} 1 <_{\mathsf{base}} g_i & (i = 1, \dots, m), \\ 1 <_{\mathsf{base}} h_j & (j = 1, \dots, n), \\ a_{\mathsf{min}} h_{\mathsf{min}}^{-1} <_{\mathsf{base}} g_{\mathsf{min}}. \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

*Proof.* The set of inequalities $\{1 <_{\mathsf{base}} g_i\}$ uniquely determines the restriction of $<_{\mathsf{base}}$ on $G$ so in particular, determines the restriction of $<_{\mathsf{base}}$ on $A$. Since $<_H$ is relatively isolated with respect to $<_H$, the additional inequalities $\{1 <_{\mathsf{base}} h_i\}$ uniquely determines the restriction of $<_{\mathsf{base}}$ on $H$. Therefore the family of inequalities (2.3) implies **[B1]** and **[B2]** in Lemma 2.3. □

The next step is to extend the ordering $<_{\mathsf{base}}$ to a compatible ordering $<_1$ of $\mathcal{F}_1(X) = GH$. For $a \in A$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_a &= \{h \in H - A \mid a(h) = a\} \\ &= \{h \in H - A \mid a <_H h <_H aa_{\mathsf{min}}\} = \{h \in H - A \mid ah_{\mathsf{min}} \leq_H h \leq_H ah_{\mathsf{M}}\}. \end{aligned}$$

First we observe the following property which plays a crucial role in proving the uniqueness.

**Lemma 2.5.** *For $g, g' \in G$ and $h, h' \in H$, if $ga(h) = g'a(h')$ then $g\Delta_{a(h)} = g'\Delta_{a(h')}$.*

*Proof.* $ga(h) = g'a(h')$ implies that $g^{-1}g' = a(h)a(h')^{-1} \in A$. This shows $(g^{-1}g')\Delta_{a(h')} = a(h)a(h')^{-1}\Delta_{a(h')} = \Delta_{a(h)}$ hence $g\Delta_{a(h)} = g'\Delta_{a(h')}$. □

**Proposition 2.6.** *There exists a unique compatible total ordering $<_1$ on $\mathcal{F}_1(X)$ that extends $<_{\mathsf{base}}$.*

*Proof.* For each $a \in A$ and $g \in G - A$, we regard $g\Delta_a$ as a totally ordered set equipped with an ordering $<_1$ defined by $gh <_1 gh'$ $(h, h' \in \Delta_a)$ if and only if $h <_H h'$.

First we check that this ordering $<_1$ is well-defined on each $g\Delta_a$. Assume that $g\Delta_a = g'\Delta_{a'}$ as a subset of $\mathcal{F}_1(X)$. Let $gh_0 = g'h_0', gh_1 = g'h_1'$ be elements of $g\Delta_a = g'\Delta_{a'}$, where $h_0, h_1 \in \Delta_a$ and $h_0', h_1' \in \Delta_{a'}$. Note that $g\Delta_a = g'\Delta_{a'}$ implies that $g^{-1}g' \in A$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} gh_0 <_1 gh_1 &\iff h_0 <_H h_1 \\ &\iff (g^{-1}g')h_0' <_H (g^{-1}g')h_1' \\ &\iff h_0' <_H h_1' \\ &\iff g'h_0' <_1 g'h_1'. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $<_1$ is a well-defined total ordering on $g\Delta_a$.

Since $\mathcal{F}_1(X) = \mathcal{F}_0(X) \cup (\bigcup g\Delta_a)$, we construct the desired ordering $<_1$ by inserting the ordered sets $g\Delta_a$ into $\mathcal{F}_0(X)$. We show that the way to inserting $g\Delta_a$ is unique.

First of all, $a <_{\mathsf{base}} h <_{\mathsf{base}} ag_{\mathsf{min}}$ for $h \in \Delta_a$, so a compatible ordering $<_1$ must satisfy

$$ga <_1 gh <_1 gag_{\mathsf{min}} \quad (g \in G - A).$$

By definition of $<_{\mathsf{base}}$, $ga \prec_{\mathsf{base}} gag_{\mathsf{min}}$, that is, there are no elements of $\mathcal{F}_{0.5}(X)$ that lies between $ga$ and $gag_{\mathsf{min}}$. This says that to get a compatible ordering, we must insert the ordered set $g\Delta_a$ between $ga$ and $gag_{\mathsf{min}}$. Moreover, by Lemma 2.5, $ga(h) = g'a(h')$ implies $g\Delta_{a(h)} = g'\Delta_{a(h')}$. This means that the ordered set $g\Delta_a$ inserted between $ga$ and $gag_{\mathsf{min}}$ must be unique.

Therefore there is the unique way of inserting $g\Delta_a$ into $\mathcal{F}_0(X)$ to get a compatible ordering on $\mathcal{F}_1(X)$. The process of inserting $g\Delta_a$ is schematically explained in Figure 2.

The resulting ordering $<_1$ is written as follows. For $x = gh$ and $x' = g'h'$ $(g \in G, h \in H)$, we have

$$x <_1 x' \iff \begin{cases} ga(h) <_{\mathsf{base}} g'a(h'), \text{ or,} \\ ga(h) = g'a(h') \text{ and } h <_{\mathsf{base}} (g^{-1}g')h'. \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

Note that by the proof of Lemma 2.5, $ga(h) = g'a(h')$ implies $g^{-1}g' \in A$, hence $(g^{-1}g')h' \in \mathcal{F}_{0.5}(X)$. Hence the inequality $h <_{\mathsf{base}} (g^{-1}g')h'$ makes sense.

□




FIGURE 2. Ordering $<_1$: Inserting $g\Delta_a$ between $ga$ and $gag_{\mathsf{min}}$.

In a similar manner, we extend the ordering $<_1$ of $\mathcal{F}_1(X)$ to a compatible ordering $<_2$ of $\mathcal{F}_2(X)$. We define the map $c_0 : \mathcal{F}_1(X) - \mathcal{F}_0(X) \to \mathcal{F}_0(X)$ by

$$c_0(x) = \max_{<_1}\{y \in \mathcal{F}_0(X) \mid y <_1 x\},$$

and for $y \in \mathcal{F}_0(X)$, we put

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_y &= \{x \in \mathcal{F}_1(X) - \mathcal{F}_0(X) \mid c_0(x) = y\} \\ &= \{x \in \mathcal{F}_1(X) \mid y <_1 x <_1 yh_{\mathsf{min}}\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 2.7.** *The map $c_0$ and the set $\Delta_y$ have the following properties.*

(1) *For $x = gh \in \mathcal{F}_1(X) - \mathcal{F}_0(X)$ ($g \in G - A, h \in H$), $c_0(gh) = a(ga(h))h_{\mathsf{M}}$. Here $a : \mathcal{F}_{0.5}(X) \to A$ is the map defined by (2.1).*
(2) *For $x, x' \in \mathcal{F}_1(X) - \mathcal{F}_0(X)$ and $h, h' \in H$, if $hc_0(x) = h'c_0(x')$ then $h\Delta_{c_0(x)} = h'\Delta_{c_0(x')}$.*

*Proof.* Note that $a(ga(h)) <_1 ga(h) <_1 gh$. By definition of $<_1$ given in (2.4), there are no elements of $\mathcal{F}_0(X) = H$ between $ga(h)$ and $gh$. Moreover, for $g \in G$ $c_0(g) = a(g)h_{\mathsf{M}}$ (see Figure 2 again). This proves $c_0(gh) = c_0(ga(h)) = a(ga(h))h_{\mathsf{M}}$.

To see (2), write $x = gy$ and $x = g'y'$ ($g, g' \in G,\ y, y' \in \mathcal{F}_0$). Then by (1), $hc_0(x) = h'c_0(x')$ implies that $h^{-1}h' = c_0(x)c_0(x')^{-1} = a(ga(y))a(g'a(y'))^{-1} \in A$. This shows $(h^{-1}h')\Delta_{c_0(x')} = \Delta_{c_0(x)}$ hence $h\Delta_{c_0(x)} = h'\Delta_{c_0(x')}$. □

**Proposition 2.8.** *There exists a unique compatible total ordering $<_2$ on $\mathcal{F}_2(X)$ that extends $<_1$.*

*Proof.* For $h \in H$ and $y \in \mathcal{F}_1(X)$, we regard $h\Delta_y$ as a totally ordered set equipped with a total ordering $<_2$ defined by $hx <_2 hx'$ ($x, x' \in \Delta_y$) if and only if $x <_1 x'$. By the same argument as Proposition 2.6, this ordering is well-defined on each subset $h\Delta_y$.

$\mathcal{F}_2(X) = \mathcal{F}_1(X) \cup (\bigcup h\Delta_y)$ so we construct the desired ordering $<_2$ by inserting ordered set $h\Delta_y$ into $\mathcal{F}_1(X)$, as we have done in Proposition 2.6.

By the compatibility requirement, for $x \in \Delta_y$ and $h \in H$, a desired extension $<_2$ must satisfy

$$hy <_2 hx <_2 hyh_{\mathsf{min}}$$

so we need to insert $h\Delta_y$ between $hc_0(x)$ and $hc_0(x)h_{\mathsf{min}}$. By Lemma 2.7 (1), $\Delta_y$ is empty unless $y = ah_{\mathsf{M}}$ for some $a \in A$, and that if $\Delta_y$ is non-empty then $hy \prec_1 hyh_{\mathsf{min}}$ for $h \in H - A$. That is, there are no elements of $\mathcal{F}_1(X)$ between $hy$ and $hyh_{\mathsf{min}}$. Moreover, Lemma 2.7 (2) shows that an ordered set $h\Delta_y$ inserted between $hy$ and $hyh_{\mathsf{min}}$ must be unique.

Thus, the process of inserting $h\Delta_y$ to $\mathcal{F}_1(X)$ is unique, and we get a well-defined compatible ordering $<_2$. Figure 3 gives schematic illustration of the inserting process.

As a consequence, the ordering $<_2$ is given as follows: For $x = hy$ and $x' = h'y'$ ($h \in H, y \in \mathcal{F}_1(X)$), we have

$$x <_2 x' \iff \begin{cases} hc_0(y) <_1 h'c_0(y'), \text{ or,} \\ hc_0(y) = h'c_0(y') \text{ and } y <_1 (h^{-1}h')y'. \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$




FIGURE 3. Ordering $<_2$: Inserting $h\Delta_y$ between $hy = hah_{\mathsf{M}}$ and $hyh_{\mathsf{min}} = haa_{\mathsf{min}}$.

Note that $hc_0(y) = h'c_0(y')$ implies $h^{-1}h' \in A$ as we have seen in the proof of Lemma 2.7 (2), so the inequality $y <_1 (h^{-1}h')y' \in \mathcal{F}_1(X)$ makes sense.

□

Now we inductively extend compatible orderings. Assume that we have defined a compatible ordering $<_i$ of $\mathcal{F}_{i+1}$. We define the map $c_{i-1} : \mathcal{F}_i(X) - \mathcal{F}_{i-1}(X) \to \mathcal{F}_{i-1}(X)$ by

$$c_{i-1}(x) = \max_{<_i}\{y \in \mathcal{F}_{i-1}(X) \mid y <_i x\}$$

and for $y \in \mathcal{F}_{i-1}(X)$, we put

$$\Delta_y = \{x \in \mathcal{F}_i(X) - \mathcal{F}_{i-1}(X) \mid c_{i-1}(x) = y\}.$$

Here we have assumed that $c_{i-1}$ is well-defined, that is, the maximal exists.

We will say that $<_i$ satisfies the *Ping-Pong property* if the ordering $<_i$ satisfies the following three properties.

**P1:** The maps $c_{i-1}$ and $c_{i-2}$ satisfy the equality

$$c_{i-1}(x) = \begin{cases} gc_{i-2}(y) & (x = gy, g \in G - A, y \in \mathcal{F}_{i-1}(X), \text{ if } i \text{ is odd}) \\ hc_{i-2}(y) & (x = hy, h \in H - A, y \in \mathcal{F}_{i-1}(X), \text{ if } i \text{ is even}). \end{cases}$$

Moreover, $c_{i-1}(x) \in \mathcal{F}_{i-2}(X) - \mathcal{F}_{i-3}(X)$.

**P2:** $c_{i-1}(x) \prec_{i-1} c_{i-1}(x)h_{\mathsf{min}}$.

**P3:** If $x \in \mathcal{F}_i(X) - \mathcal{F}_{i-2}(X)$, $x \prec_i xh_{\mathsf{min}}$.

The reason why we call these properties "Ping-Pong" will be explained in Remark 2.12. Note that Ping-Pong property **[P2]** shows that

$$\Delta_y = \{x \in \mathcal{F}_i(X) - \mathcal{F}_{i-1}(X) \mid y <_i x <_i yh_{\mathsf{min}}\}. \tag{2.6}$$

**Lemma 2.9.** *The ordering $<_2$ satisfies the Ping-Pong property.*

*Proof.* This is easily seen from the description (2.5) of $<_2$ (see Figure 3 again).

For $x = hy \in \mathcal{F}_2(X) - \mathcal{F}_1(X)$ ($h \in H - A$, $y \in \mathcal{F}_1(X) - \mathcal{F}_0(X)$), $hc_0(y) <_2 hy$. There are no elements of $\mathcal{F}_1(X) - \mathcal{F}_0(X)$ that lie between $hc_0(y)$ and $hy$ so $c_1(x) = hc_0(y)$. In particular, $c_1(x) \in \mathcal{F}_0(X) = H$ hence by definition of $<_1$ given in (2.4) (see Figure 2 again), $c_1(x) \prec_1 c_1(x)h_{\mathsf{min}}$. Moreover, the description (2.5) of $<_2$ shows

$$\begin{cases} x \prec_2 xh_{\mathsf{min}} & \text{if } x \notin H \\ x \prec_2 xh_{\mathsf{M}}^{-1}g_{\mathsf{min}} & \text{if } x \in H. \end{cases}$$

□

The Ping-Pong property shows the counterparts of Lemma 2.5 and 2.7.

**Lemma 2.10.** *Assume that $<_i$ satisfies the Ping-Pong property and let $x, x' \in \mathcal{F}_i(X) - \mathcal{F}_{i-1}(X)$.*

- *If $i$ is odd, then $gc_{i-1}(x) = g'c_{i-1}(x')$ $(g, g' \in G)$ implies $g\Delta_{c_{i-1}(x)} = g'\Delta_{c_{i-1}(x')}$.*
- *If $i$ is even, then $hc_{i-1}(x) = h'c_{i-1}(x')$ $(h, h' \in H)$ implies $h\Delta_{c_{i-1}(x)} = h'\Delta_{c_{i-1}(x')}$.*

*Proof.* We show the case $i$ is odd. The case $i$ is even is similar. Put $y = c_{i-1}(x)$ and $y' = c_{i-1}(x')$, respectively. We show $g'\Delta_{y'} \subset g\Delta_y$. The converse inclusion is proved similarly. By (2.6), $z' \in \Delta_{y'}$ if and only if $y' <_{i-1} z' <_{i-1} y'h_{\mathsf{min}}$. By compatibility,

$$y = g^{-1}g'y' <_{i-1} (g^{-1}g')z' <_{i-1} g^{-1}g'y'h_{\mathsf{min}} = yh_{\mathsf{min}}$$

so $(g^{-1}g')z' \in \Delta_y$. This proves $g'z' \in g\Delta_y$. □

The following proposition completes the construction of isolated ordering $<_X$.

**Proposition 2.11.** *If $<_i$ $(i > 1)$ is a compatible ordering with the Ping-Pong property, then there exists a unique compatible ordering $<_{i+1}$ on $\mathcal{F}_{i+1}(X)$ that extends $<_i$. Moreover, this compatible ordering $<_{i+1}$ also satisfies the Ping-Pong property.*

*Proof.* The construction of $<_{i+1}$ is almost the same as the construction of $<_2$. We treat the case $i$ is even. The case $i$ is odd is similar.

We regard each $g\Delta_y$ $(y \in \mathcal{F}_{i-1}(X), g \in G - A)$ as a totally ordered set, by equipping a total ordering $<_{i+1}$ defined by $gx <_{i+1} gx'$ $(x, x' \in \Delta_y)$ if and only if $x <_i x'$. By the same argument as Proposition 2.6, the ordering $<_{i+1}$ is well-defined on each $g\Delta_y$. The desired compatible ordering $<_{i+1}$ on $\mathcal{F}_{i+1}(X) = \mathcal{F}_i(X) \cup (\bigcup g\Delta_y)$ is obtained by inserting $g\Delta_y$ into $\mathcal{F}_i(X)$.

By the Ping-Pong property **[P2]**, for $y \in \mathcal{F}_{i-1}(X)$ if $\Delta_y$ is non-empty, then $y \prec_{i-1} yh_{\mathsf{min}}$. Thus we need to insert $g\Delta_y$ between $gy$ and $gyh_{\mathsf{min}}$. By the Ping-Pong property **[P3]**, $gy \prec_i gyh_{\mathsf{min}}$, so there are no elements of $\mathcal{F}_i(X)$ between $gy$ and $gyh_{\mathsf{min}}$. Moreover, Lemma 2.10 shows that there are exactly one ordered set of the form $g\Delta_y$ that should be inserted between $gy$ and $gyh_{\mathsf{min}}$. Therefore the process of insertions is unique, and the resulting ordering $<_{i+1}$ is given as follows: For $x = gy$ and $x' = g'y'$, $(g, g' \in G$ and $y, y' \in \mathcal{F}_i(X))$, we define

$$x <_{i+1} x' \iff \begin{cases} gc_{i-1}(y) <_i g'c_{i-1}(y'), \text{ or,} \\ gc_{i-1}(y) = g'c_{i-1}(y') \text{ and } y <_i (g^{-1}g')y'. \end{cases} \tag{2.7}$$

Next we show that $<_{i+1}$ also satisfies the Ping-Pong property. We have inserted $x = gy \in \mathcal{F}_{i+1}(X) - \mathcal{F}_i(X)$ $(g \in G - A, y \in \mathcal{F}_i(X))$ between $gc_{i-1}(y)$ and $gc_{i-1}(y)h_{\mathsf{min}}$. By definition of $<_{i+1}$, there are no elements of $\mathcal{F}_i(X)$ that lie between $x$ and $gc_{i-1}(x)$, hence $c_i(x) = gc_{i-1}(y)$. By **[P1]** for $<_i$, $c_{i-1}(y) \in \mathcal{F}_{i-2}(X) - \mathcal{F}_{i-3}(X)$. Hence $c_i(x) = gc_{i-1}(y) \in \mathcal{F}_{i-1}(X) - \mathcal{F}_{i-2}(X)$ so $<_{i+1}$ satisfies **[P1]**. Moreover by **[P3]** for $<_i$, $c_i(x) \in \mathcal{F}_{i-1}(X) - \mathcal{F}_{i-2}(X)$ implies that $c_i(x) \prec_i c_i(x)h_{\mathsf{min}}$ hence $<_{i+1}$ satisfies **[P2]**.

Finally we show that $<_{i+1}$ satisfies **[P3]**. Assume that $x \in \mathcal{F}_{i+1}(X) - \mathcal{F}_i(X)$, and put $x = gy$ $(g \in G - A$, $y \in \mathcal{F}_i(X) - \mathcal{F}_{i-1}(X))$. By **[P3]** for $<_i$, we have $y \prec_i yh_{\mathsf{min}}$. Hence by definition of $<_{i+1}$ we have $x = gy \prec_{i+1} gyh_{\mathsf{min}} = xh_{\mathsf{min}}$.

If $x \in \mathcal{F}_i(X) - \mathcal{F}_{i-1}(X) \subset \mathcal{F}_i - \mathcal{F}_{i-2}(X)$, then by **[P3]** for $<_i$ we have $x \prec_i xh_{\mathsf{min}}$. No elements of $\mathcal{F}_{i+1}(X) - \mathcal{F}_i(X)$ are inserted between $x$ and $xh_{\mathsf{min}}$, hence $x \prec_{i+1} xh_{\mathsf{min}}$.

□

*Proof of Theorem 1.3.* For $x, x' \in X$, we define the isolated ordering $<_X = <_X^{(1)}$ by

$$x <_X x' \iff x <_N x'$$

where $N$ is chosen to be sufficiently large so that $x, x' \in \mathcal{F}_N(X)$. Proposition 2.11 shows that $<_X$ is a well-defined left ordering of $X$. By Proposition 2.4, $<_X$ is isolated with characteristic positive set

$$\{g_1, \dots, g_m, h_1, \dots, h_n, h_{\mathsf{min}}a_{\mathsf{min}}^{-1}g_{\mathsf{min}}\},$$

if $\{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$ is a characteristic positive set of $<_G$ and $\{h_1, \dots, h_n\}$ is a characteristic positive set of $<_H$ relative to $A$.

It remains to show that $A$ is a stepping with respect to $<_X$. To see this, for $x \in X$, define

$$a(x) = a \circ \cdots \circ c_{N-2} \circ c_N(x)$$

where $N$ is taken so that $x \in \mathcal{F}_N(X)$. By definition of $c_i$, $a(x) = \max_{<_X}\{a \in A \mid a \leq_X x\}$. □

**Remark 2.12.** Here we explain why we call the properties **[P1]**–**[P3]** the Ping-Pong property. This may help to understand isolated ordering $<_X$ we constructed.

Let us divide $X - A$ into two disjoint subsets $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{O}$ as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{E} = \bigcup_{a\in A}\{x \in X \mid a <_X x <_X ah_{\mathsf{M}}\} \\ \mathcal{O} = \bigcup_{a\in A}\{x \in X \mid ag_{\mathsf{min}} <_X x <_X aa_{\mathsf{min}}.\} \end{cases}$$

By definition of $<_{\mathsf{base}}$, $\mathcal{F}_0(X) - A = H - A \subset \mathcal{E}$, and by definition of $<_1$, $\mathcal{F}_1(X) - \mathcal{F}_0(X) = GH - H \subset \mathcal{O}$. Now the Ping-Pong property **[P1]** says that

$$\begin{cases} g(\mathcal{F}_{2i}(X) - \mathcal{F}_{2i-1}(X)) \subset \mathcal{E} & (g \in G - A) \\ h(\mathcal{F}_{2i+1}(X) - \mathcal{F}_{2i-1}(X)) \subset \mathcal{O} & (h \in H - A) \end{cases}$$

Thus, we conclude

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{E} = \{\text{even part}\} = \bigcup_i(\mathcal{F}_{2i}(X) - \mathcal{F}_{2i-1}(X)) \\ \mathcal{O} = \{\text{odd part}\} = \bigcup_i(\mathcal{F}_{2i+1}(X) - \mathcal{F}_{2i}(X)) \end{cases}$$

and for $g \in G - A$ and $h \in H - A$, we have

$$g(\mathcal{O}) \subset \mathcal{E}, \quad h(\mathcal{E}) \subset \mathcal{O}.$$

Therefore the subsets $\mathcal{O}$ and $\mathcal{E}$ provides the setting of a famous Ping-Pong argument. The rest of the Ping-Pong properties **[P2],[P3]**, as we have seen in the proof of Proposition 2.11, rather follows from **[P1]**. This explains why we call the properties **[P1]**–**[P3]** the Ping-Pong property.

**Remark 2.13.** Here we briefly explain the computability of the resulting isolated ordering $<_X$.

By (2.7), for $x \in \mathcal{F}_{i+1}(X) - \mathcal{F}_i(X)$, determining whether $1 <_X x$ (which is equivalent to $1 <_{i+1} x$) is reduced to the computation of $c_i(x)$ and the ordering $<_i$. By Ping-Pong property **[P1]**, $c_i(x)$ is computed from the function $c_{i-1}$. Thus, eventually one can reduce to the computations of the base orderings $<_G$ and $<_H$ and the map $a : \mathcal{F}_{0.5}(X) \to A$. That is, we have:
*The ordering $<_X$ is algorithmically computable if and only if the orderings $<_G$, $<_H$ and the map $a : \mathcal{F}_{0.5}(X) \to A$ are algorithmically computable.*

The problem may occur when we want to compute the map $a$. Even if we have a nice algorithm to compute $<_G$ and $<_H$, this does not guarantee an algorithm to compute the map $a$, in general because it involves the maximum.

Finally we study convex subgroups. Recall that a subset $C$ of a totally ordered set $(S, <_S)$ is *convex* if $c \le_S s \le_S c'$ $(c, c' \in C, s \in S)$ implies $s \in C$. For a subset $T$ of $(S, <_S)$ the *convex hull* $\mathsf{Conv}_S(T)$ of $T$ in $S$ is the minimum convex subset that contains $T$. Namely,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{Conv}_S(T) &= \bigcap_{\{C\supset T:\text{convex}\}} C \\ &= \{s \in S \mid \exists t, t' \in T, t \le_S s \le_S t'\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $(G, <_G)$ be a left-ordered group and let $A$ be a subgroup of $G$. We denote the restriction of $<_G$ on $A$ by $<_A$. We say a convex subgroup $B$ of $(A, <_A)$ is a $(G, <_G)$-*strongly convex* if $\mathsf{Conv}_G(B)$ is a subgroup of $G$.

**Proposition 2.14.** *Let $<_X$ be an isolated ordering on $X = G *_A H$ in Theorem 1.3. If a subgroup $B$ of $A$ is both $(G, <_G)$- and $(H, <_H)$-strongly convex, then $B$ is $(X, <_X)$-strongly convex. In particular, if $B$ and $B'$ are different then $\mathsf{Conv}_X(B)$ and $\mathsf{Conv}_X(B')$ yield different convex subgroups of $(X, <_X)$.*

*Proof.* The case $B = \{1\}$ is trivial so we assume that $B \neq \{1\}$. By induction on $N$, we prove that if $x \in \mathsf{Conv}_X(B) \cap \mathcal{F}_N(X)$ then $xx' \in \mathsf{Conv}_X(B)$ for any $x' \in \mathsf{Conv}_X(B)$.

First assume that $x \in \mathcal{F}_{0.5}(X) = G \cup H$. For $x' \in \mathsf{Conv}_X(B)$, take $b \in B$ so that $b^{-1} <_X x' <_X b$. Then $xb^{-1} <_X xx' <_X xb$. Since $B$ is $(G, <_G)$- and $(H, <_H)$-strongly convex, $xb, xb^{-1} \in \mathsf{Conv}_G(B) \cup \mathsf{Conv}_H(B) \subset \mathsf{Conv}_X(B)$, hence $xx' \in \mathsf{Conv}_X(B)$.

To show general case, assume that $x \in \mathcal{F}_N(X) - \mathcal{F}_{N-1}(X)$ and put $x = gy$ $(g \in G - A, y \in \mathcal{F}_{N-1}(X))$. We consider the case $N$ is odd, since the case $N$ is even is similar.

By Theorem 1.3 (3), $A$ is a stepping so

$$a(y) = \max_{<_X}\{a \in A \mid a <_X y\}$$

exists. On the other hand, $x \in \mathsf{Conv}_X(B)$ so there exists $b \in B \subset A$ such that $b^{-1} <_X x <_X b$. By definition of $a(y)$,

$$b^{-1} \leq_X ga(y) <_X x <_X b$$

hence $ga(y) \in \mathsf{Conv}_X(B)$. We have assumed that $B$ is a non-trivial convex subgroup of $A$, so $a_{\mathsf{min}} \in B$. Since $1 <_X a(y)^{-1}y <_X a_{\mathsf{min}}$, $a(y)^{-1}y \in \mathsf{Conv}_X(B)$. By induction, $(a(y)^{-1}y)x' \in \mathsf{Conv}_X(B)$ if $x' \in \mathsf{Conv}_X(B)$. This shows that

$$xx' = (ga(y))(a(y)^{-1}y)x' \in \mathsf{Conv}_X(B)$$

as desired. □

We close the paper by giving new examples of isolated orderings obtained by Theorem 1.3.

**Example 2.15.** Let $B_3$ be the 3-strand braid group, given by

$$\begin{aligned} B_3 &= \mathbb{Z} *_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z} = \langle x, y \mid x^2 = y^3 \rangle \\ &= \langle \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \mid \sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_1 = \sigma_2\sigma_1\sigma_2 \rangle . \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 1.3, $B_3$ admits an isolated ordering $<_{DD}$, which is known as the Duborvina-Dubrovin ordering [4]. The Dubrovina-Dubrovin ordering is discrete with minimum positive element $\sigma_2$. For $p > 1$, let $A = A_p$ be the kernel of the mod $p$ abelianization map $e : B_n \to \mathbb{Z}_p$. Since for $x \in B_3$

$$\cdots \prec_{DD} x\sigma_2^{-1} \prec_{DD} x \prec_{DD} x\sigma_2 \prec_{DD} x\sigma_2^2 \prec_{DD} \cdots ,$$

$A$ is a stepping with respect to $<_{DD}$: The maximum and minimum functions are given by

$$a(x) = x\sigma_2^{-e(x)}, \quad a_+(x) = x\sigma_2^{p-e(x)} \quad (e(x) \in \{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\}).$$

By Theorem 1.3, $X = X_p = B_3 *_{A_p} B_3$ admits an isolated ordering $<_X$. The convex subgroup $B$ of $A$ generated by $\sigma_2^p$ is $(B_3, <_{DD})$-strongly convex, hence by Proposition 2.14, $\mathsf{Conv}_X(B)$ is a non-trivial proper convex subgroup of $(X, <_X)$. $(X, <_X)$ contains another non-trivial proper convex subgroup generated by the $<_X$-minimum positive elements, so $(X, <_X)$ has at least two non-trivial proper convex subgroup. Iterating this kinds of constructions, starting from $\mathbb{Z}$ we are able to construct isolated ordering with arbitrary many proper non-trivial convex subgroups.

## References


[1] V. Bludov and A. Glass, *Word problems, embedddings, and free products of right-ordered groups with amalgamated subgroups,* Proc. London. Math. Soc. **99** (2009) 585–608.

[2] P. Dehornoy, I.Dynnikov, D.Rolfsen and B.Wiest, *Ordering Braids,* Mathematical Surveys and Monographs **148**, Amer. Math. Soc. 2008.

[3] P. Dehornoy, *Monoids of O-type, subword reversing, and ordered groups,* J. Group Theory. to appear.

[4] T. Dubrovina and T. Dubrovin, *On braid groups,* Sb. Math, **192** (2001), 693–703.

[5] T. Ito, *Dehornoy-like left orderings and isolated left orderings,* J. Algebra **374** (2013), 42–58.

[6] T. Ito, *Construction of isolated left orderings via partially central cyclic amalgamation*, arXiv:1107.0545.

[7] V. Kopytov and N. Medvedev, *Right-ordered groups,* Siberian School of Algebra and Logic, Consultants Bureau, 1996.

[8] A. Navas, *On the dynamics of (left) orderable groups,* Ann. Inst. Fourier, **60** (2010), 1685–1740.

[9] A. Navas, *A remarkable family of left-ordered groups: Central extensions of Hecke groups,* J. Algebra, **328** (2011), 31–42.

[10] C. Rivas, *Left-orderings on free products of groups,* J. Algebra **350** (2012), 318–329.

[11] C. Rivas and R. Tessera, *On the space of left-orderings of virtually solvable groups,* arXiv:1209.3251

[12] A. Sikora, *Topology on the spaces of orderings of groups,* Bull. London Math. Soc. **36**, (2004), 519-526.



Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Kyoto university Kyoto, 606-8502, Japan

*E-mail address*: tetitoh@kurims.kyoto-u.ac.jp

*URL*: http://www.kurims.kyoto-u.ac.jp/~tetitoh/